Continue

Noam chomsky's theory of how language is acquired

The process by which humans acquire their native language has long been a subject of intrigue among linguists. This question becomes even more complex when considering how we learn our first language, as opposed to a second one, which can be studied in an intentional and systematic way. The work of Noam Chomsky has had a significant influence on the understanding of language acquisition. Chomsky's view is that language is something special, almost miraculous. He is not interested in explaining how language emerged through evolutionary terms or by relating it to animal communication systems. Instead, he suggests that language came into existence as a kind of random mutation, which some might consider the secular version of attributing its origin to an act of God. However, this perspective is not without its criticisms. For instance, certain animals have been observed with sophisticated communication systems that could be seen as precursors to human language. Moreover, the lack of data on how language originated does not necessarily mean it should be considered fundamentally mysterious. A central tenet of Chomsky's theory of language acquisition is the doctrine of the independence of language from other elements of human capacity or activity. This idea suggests that language should be understood without reference to other aspects of human ability or behavior. Several arguments support this independence, providing a strong basis for understanding language in isolation. Language, as conceived by Chomsky, has inherent and universal principles shared across all languages. This unique nature sparks debate over whether language operates independently within the mind or if it's intertwined with other cognitive skills. The argument for its independence stems from the distinct way children learn language, suggesting a separate mental organ focused on language: the "language faculty." Chomsky likens this faculty to physical organs like the heart, visual system, and motor coordination system. The question arises as to why we wouldn't characterize language in terms of an organ, given its self-contained and qualitatively distinct processes. The universality of language across species is another reason for considering it a common human possession, albeit varying little due to serious pathology. This shifts the focus from knowledge of specific languages to understanding the language faculty as a whole. Criticism to this uniqueness often follows by questioning whether language can be spatially located within the brain like other organs. This debate underscores the essence of linguistic inquiry—studying not particular languages but rather the unique capacity for human language, its principles, and how it functions within the mind. totally uniqe: thats whats gonna be, a critisum basd on teh observashun of animalz. ppl hav poinTed out that anamalz hav bin able to lern even mor complicated comunicashun sistemz than they do in the wil in certin labratery kontexz. its posstulated that these konstitutz either languajz or genuwin precursors 2 languajz. th chomskyan rejoindrz is genraly 2 qwestion whethir them languajz usd in dese eksperimenzs ar fully humn-lik in incorporatin certin principlz that chomskyans take 2 b ubiquitous of humn languajz. maybi therfore, itz possibl 2 lern dem via ozher facultez than languaj at teh anamal's disposiz. in a humn bein som aspektz of languaj may also biz learnabl by ozher meenz than th languaj faciluty. quit klarly, som interisting qwestzion begginz iz goin on heer, at th poynt whr chomsky wizhes 2 claim both that languajz all hav such a certen featur, and that eny ozher comunicashun sistemz arnt languajz becuz dem dont hav a certen featur. Data available to them (e.g., spoken words around them) and analyzing how they learn to speak can be studied. However, understanding how the initial data becomes their own speaking patterns is challenging. We're seeking explanations. A possible approach is the 'Linguistic Acquisition Device' (LAD) model, which requires three levels of explanation: observational adequacy (predicting grammaticality in adult speech), descriptive adequacy (addressing native speaker linguistic competence), and explanatory adequacy (explaining links between competence and primary data). The 'Plato's Problem' and "Poverty of the Stimulus" concepts arise from Chomsky's ideas on language acquisition. If LAD outputs don't match inputs, it suggests that our linguistic knowledge stems from internal mental structures. This is often referred to as the "poverty of the stimulus" argument. Alternative approaches include empiricism, which emphasizes using extensive linguistic experience to generate better competence from less data, possibly due to underlying structural or receptive brain mechanisms.